

May 12, 1998

Attachment 1

FISCAL YEAR 1997-98 LOCAL GOVERNMENT WASTE TIRE CLEANUP MATCHING GRANT PROGRAM SCORING CRITERIA

Applicants must score at least 75 out of the 100 General Review Criteria points to qualify for grant funding. Funding is limited to establishing permanent infrastructures.

Points	Description
GENERAL REVIEW CRITERIA: <i>Must attain a minimum score of 75% to be considered for funding</i>	
30	1. NEED – Grant proposal clearly describes and demonstrates the local or statewide need for the project and the benefits and end products resulting from the project. For example, proposal: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Provides convincing reasons why the project should be funded • Addresses identified gap in service availability or current unmet need • Describes and documents the problem • Supports the existence of the problem with surveys, studies • Adequately describes any health and safety threats or environmental concerns
20	2. OBJECTIVES – Work Statement and grant narrative are sufficiently detailed to determine that the project: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Is based on the identified need described in the narrative ▪ Describes specific and measurable goals and objectives ▪ Demonstrates that objectives can be achieved within indicated time frame
20	3. METHODOLOGY – Grant proposal describes by task the activities to be undertaken to achieve the objectives. For example, proposal: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Describes why the proposed activities are the best way to address the identified need ▪ Describes in detail how the objectives will be met with available time and resources ▪ Identifies staffing required to carry out the proposed project ▪ Describes involvement of cooperating organizations ▪ Presents a specific plan for future funding
10	4. EVALUATION – Grant proposal describes a method to evaluate the success of the project and determine whether objectives were accomplished. For example, proposal: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Includes both process and outcome evaluation ▪ Describes a method for evaluating and modifying methods during project implementation ▪ Describes clearly the criteria for determining success ▪ States who will be responsible for the evaluation ▪ Explains any statistical tests or questionnaires to be used ▪ Describes any evaluation reports to be produced
10	5. BUDGET – Grant proposal demonstrates that the project is cost effective in relation to the location, source, quality, and quantity of targeted wastes. For example: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Budget itemization is sufficiently detailed to determine that proposed expenses are reasonable ▪ Quotes, estimates, or other documentation to support the costs claimed are provided ▪ All program tasks described in the Work Statement and narrative are itemized in the budget ▪ Cost savings are described, e.g., use of volunteer labor, in-kind services, recycling options, use of existing promotional materials etc. ▪ Budget items for miscellaneous, contingency, or managerial costs are clearly described and kept to a minimum
10	6. COMPLETENESS, LETTERS OF SUPPORT, EXPERIENCE, ETC. – Grant Proposal is clearly presented and complete as required in the application instructions including adherence to all specified deadlines. Includes evidence that the applicant or its contractor(s) have sufficient staff resources, technical expertise and experience successfully managing grant programs, to carry out the proposed project. For example, proposal: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Includes letters of support for the project: ▪ Addresses ability of the applicant to coordinate contracted activities, if applicable ▪ Includes resumes, endorsements, references, etc. ▪ Describes past grants received from CIWMB and relationship to current proposal
PREFERENCE CRITERIA (30 possible points)	
20	7. Verification of disposition, reuse, or recycling of waste tires removed.
10	8. Enforcement and Prevention – Specifies enforcement action to prevent recurrence of illegal waste tire dumping.

Attachment 2

STAFF FUNDING RECOMMENDATIONS

**FISCAL YEAR 1997-98 LOCAL GOVERNMENT WASTE TIRE CLEANUP
MATCHING GRANT PROGRAM**

Meeting Minimum Score

Funding Available

List A

Applicant	CIWMB Accession No.	Funds Requested	Funds Recommended	Total Funding
San Bernardino County Code Enforcement Agency	2550	\$50,000	\$50,000	\$50,000
City of Rialto	2551	2,876.05	2,876.05	52,876.05
Plumas-Sierra Fairground	2552	8,400	8,400	61,276.05
City of Bakersfield	2553	28,940	28,940	90,216.05
City of Modesto	2554	8,300	8,300	98,516.05
Department of Public Works, Sierra County	2555	38,952	38,952	137,468.05
Regional Waste Mgmt. Authority of Yuba and Sutter Counties	2556	23,132	19,632	157,100.05
City of Hesperia Fire District	2557	14,154.64	10,685.74	167,785.79